Remarks

In the final Office Action mailed May 13, 2008, claims 1 and 3-17 are pending and claims 1 and 3-17 stand finally rejected. The Applicants have amended claims 1, 3, 5-6, 9-12, and 15-17 and have cancelled claims 4, 7-8, and 13-14. The Applicants have added new claims 21-24. The Applicants traverse the rejection herein.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-11, and 13-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view U.S. Patent No.: 6,559,979 (Ryan) in combination with U.S. Patent No.: 6,938,261 (Camara). The Examiner further rejected dependent claim 12 as being obvious in view of Ryan, Camara, and U.S. Patent Publication No.: 2001/0042078 (Anwar). The Applicants submit that amended claims 1, 3, 5-6, 9-12, and 15-17 are non-obvious in view of the cited art.

Amended independent claim 1, paraphrased herein, recites a multifunction device. The multifunction device includes a communication module configured to communicate with a server over a network. The multifunction device also includes a controller module which is configured to control the operation of the multifunction device and interface with business applications running on the server. The server provides business application interfaces to the multifunction device for the business applications running on the server. The multifunction device also includes a user interface module, which is configured to allow a user to enter and receive data from the business application interfaces. A source interface module in the multifunction device is configured to receive input data from a document data source. Using the input data from the document data source and the user input data, the controller module is further configured to transmit the information to the business application executing on the server.

Ryan teaches a facsimile machine operable for printing, scanning, and faxing of documents (column 1, lines 62-67; FIG. 1; Abstract). In Ryan, the facsimile machine has its operating modes set up by a personal computer connected to the facsimile machine through a communication line (Abstract). Ryan also teaches that the facsimile machine can be connected to multiple computers through a network (FIG. 4). The Applicants submit that Ryan does teach or reasonably suggest "a controller module configured to control the operation of the multifunction device and interface with a business application executing on the server, wherein

the server provides a business application interface to the multifunction device for interfacing to the business application". In Ryan, the functions available to the facsimile machine are specifically defined by a table (FIG. 6). FIG. 6 shows various functions which can be assigned to different users, such as 'fax', 'copies', and 'send to pc'. These functions are stored in ROM 152 (see FIG. 5) within the facsimile machine. Although various functions may be assigned to different users, the functions available to the users do not change.

The Applicants further submit that Ryan does not teach or reasonably suggest the claim 1 limitation "a user interface module configured to receive the business application interface from the server and provide input and output fields for the business application interface to a user for user input". In Ryan, a server does not provide an application interface for an application running on the server.

Camara teaches a computer system using script-based device drivers for operating hardware devices (Abstract). Camara further teaches that the script based device drivers "serve the function of a regular device driver" and that the script-based device driver handles the various interface functions required by the device driver interface that is part of an operating system (column 4, lines 32-44). Camara also teaches that the scripts define the behavior of the hardware device in response to requests and notifications from the operating system and/or the application (column 4, lines 48-51). The Applicants submit that Camara teaches an alternative method to a pre-compiled device driver for interfacing hardware to an operating system, using scripts. As any device driver, the script based driver in Camara provides an interface between the operating system on the computer and the functionality of the hardware device. Camara does not teach or reasonably suggest that a server running a business application can provide a business application interface to a device. Camara also does not teach or reasonably suggest that the business application interface provided to the device from the server is operable to accept user input or transmit data to the application executing on the server, and that claim 1 is non-obvious in view of the combination of Ryan and Camara. The Applicants submit that amended independent claim 15, which recites similar limitations as claim 1, is non-obvious for at least the same reasons. Dependent claims 3, 5-6, 9-12, 16-17, and 21-24 are non-obvious for depending on allowable base claims 1 and 15.

Conclusion

The Applicants submit that claims 1, 3, 5-6, 9-12, 15-17, and 21-24 are non-obvious in view of the cited art, and therefore respectfully request the Examiner allow claims 1, 3, 5-6, 9-12, 15-17, and 21-24.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 7, 2008   /Sean J. Varley/

                                        Sean J. Varley, Reg. No. 62,397
                                        Duft, Bornsen & Fishman, LLP
                                        1526 Spruce Street, Suite 302
                                        Boulder, CO 80302
                                        (303) 786-7687
                                        (303) 786-7691 (fax)